NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday, December 3, 1981

TIME AND PLACE:

2:30 - 3:30

The Cabinet Room

SUBJECT:

Monitoring Overseas Direct

Employment (MODE) and Civil Defense

PARTICIPANTS:

President Ronald Reagan

Vice President George Bush

State

Under Secretary Walter J. Stoessel

Richard Kennedy

Defense

Deputy Secretary Frank C. Carlucci

Justice

Attorney General William French Smith

Commerce

Secretary Malcolm H. Baldrige

CIA

Admiral Bobby Inman

OMB

William Schneider

JCS

General David C. Jones

AID

M. Peter McPherson

R. Thomas Rollis

ICA

Charles Z. Wick

FEMA

Major General Bennett L. Lewis

White House

Edwin Meese III

James A. Baker III

RADM James W. Nance

Janet Colson

NSC

Colonel Horace Russell

Major Chris Shoemaker

CECDET

DECLASSIFIED IN PART

NARA. Date _

NLS MO5-016#1912

Manage 197

6

Mr. Schneider agreed with Deputy Secretary Carlucci that the issue was one of priorities. Option 2, with an affirmative decision in 1984 to proceed with blast sheltering and industrial protection, would mean a \$7 billion commitment. He speculated that the resources for civil defense will probably come from the national security budget.

Deputy Secretary Carlucci then asked if he could change his vote.

<u>Under Secretary Stoessel</u> agreed that civil defense is an important part of our strategic nuclear deterrent, although the major portion of our deterrent remains our offensive forces. Funding is the key civil defense issue. The most cost-effective program would appear to be population relocation. The Department of State supports Option 2.

General Jones said that in isolation one could make a strong case for civil defense. The JCS, however, put the priority on other systems. The JCS supports Option 2.

Mr. Wick said that ICA supports a civil defense program because of its high deterrent value. He added that as a private citizen he would prefer to have an 80 percent chance for survival as opposed to 40 percent. He then said that we must do whatever has to be done in order to develop an effective program within responsible resource constraints. He asked if we knew what the economic impact of civil defense would be.

Secretary Baldrige added that much to his chagrin, we do not have a credible civil defense program. It is essential that we show our commitment to a credible program and the beginnings of effective program implementation. The Department of Commerce supported Option 2.

Mr. Meese reiterated the issue of priority. He said that for the foreseeable future we need to demonstrate our commitment to civil defense but avoid a major increase in expenditures. Option 2 therefore appears to be the right balance.

The President then pointed out that both Options 2 and 3 require investment of some \$237 million in FY 83. He added that there was no question in his mind that the Soviet Union has a tremendous advantage in civil defense just as it has an advantage in weapons.

Deputy Secretary Carlucci said that the Soviet Union is already at Option 3.







Admiral Nance pointed out that the Soviet population distribution gives the Soviets a further advantage; all our population is concentrated in relatively fewer targets.

The President then said that it was obvious that no one wanted Option 1.

Mr. Schneider said that Option 1 is attractive in that it doesn't carry with it any substantial budgetary increases.

General Lewis agreed, saying that Option 1 holds us where we are now. He characterized Option 1 as not a meaningful civil defense program.

Secretary Baldrige argued that Option 1 would not help the credibility problem.

The President said that Option 2 does not yet commit us to the most expensive program. He lamented that it was a shame we did not have extensive caves near our population centers.

Attorney General Smith asked what the \$237 million would buy.

General Lewis responded that it would greatly increase our current system of improving population relocation to the point where we could expect in five years to have the capacity to protect 80 percent of the population.

Deputy Secretary Carlucci added that it would buy no blast shelters.

General Lewis continued that the money would also be used to improve the responsiveness of state and local civil defense systems.

Mr. Wick asked if FEMA could determine the net cost of the program by considering what the economic impact would be of civil defense expenditures.

The President pointed out that the Soviets already have underground factories.

Mr. Meese then suggested that we submit a brief Options Paper to the President for his decision.

The President agreed and said he would like to stew about the issue. He then asked if evacuation of cities is practical.

SECRET





Admiral Nance responded by saying that JCS estimates that if the Soviets evacuate their cities prior to a nuclear attack, their losses would be 15 million, a number less than they lost in the Second World War or in the purges. The U.S., on the other hand, would lose some 150 million people. An effective civil defense program can cut that down to less than 40 million.

The President asked how we could care for all the evacuees that leave high-risk areas.

Mr. Meese said that it would be just like a weekend in New York State.

General Lewis said that it can be done. He related the explanations given to him by Dr. Edward Teller and outlined some systems that could be put in place early to help with the evacuation itself and to beef-up the host areas. He then said that the evacuees would not have to stay in host areas very long; nature would take care of most of the radiation and decontamination operations would also be conducted.

Mr. Meese then said that the most important element in the program now is the psychological advantage it would offer.

The President then said that he did not need an Options Paper. He then approved Option 2.

The Vice President then related a story about Soviet Ambassador Malik who was in Japan in the Hiroshima bombings.

The President responded with a joke about the country boy who wanted to be far enough away from a nuclear blast that he could say, "What was that?"

The meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m.



